KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) 1 FILED

JUL 2 2 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING

OLEF CUS. DISTRICT OF COLLEGE MA United States Attorney 2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division 3 TRACIE L. BROWN (CSBN 184339) 4 Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, CA 94102 6 Telephone: (415) 436-6917 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 12 No. 3-05-70460 MEJ UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13 **IPROPOSEDI ORDER AND STIPULATION** Plaintiff, 14 WAIVING TIME UNDER RULE 5.1 AND **EXCLUDING TIME FROM JULY 15, 2005** 15 v. TO JULY 29, 2005 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION IRMA RUIZ. 16 (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)) Defendant. 17 18 The parties are scheduled to appear before the Court on July 22, 2005. The Court enters this 19 order scheduling a new preliminary hearing/arraignment date of July 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., 20 before the Honorable Edward M. Chen, and documenting the exclusion of time under Federal 21 Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A), from July 22 22, 2005 to July 29, 2005. The defendant having been informed of her rights by counsel, the 23 parties agreed, and the Court finds and holds, as follows: 24 1. The defendant waived the time limits for a preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of 25 Criminal Procedure 5.1. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny 26 both defense and government counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking 27 into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant and government 28

STIPULATION AND ORDER

3-05-70460 MEJ

1

2 3

5

6

4

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

continuity of counsel.

- 2. Counsel for the defense believes that postponing the preliminary hearing is in his client's best interest, and that it is not in his client's interest for the United States to indict the case before the July 29, 2005 preliminary hearing date. The parties are investigating a preindictment disposition of the case.
- 3. The defendant agreed to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny both government and defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant and the government continuity of counsel.
- 4. Given these circumstances, the Court found that the ends of justice served by excluding the period from July 22, 2005 to July 29, 2005, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Id. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
- 5. Accordingly, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court ordered that the period from July 22, 2005 to July 29, 2005, be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv).
- 4. The Court scheduled a new preliminary hearing/arraignment date of July 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., before the Honorable Edward M. Chen.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: 7/19/05

Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: \_ 7/20/01

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Attorney for IRMA RUIZ

United States Magistrate Judge